



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Alsfelder Passionsspieles diese Stelle hergeholt hat. Wie bei ihm ist das auch bei den anderen Dramatikern der Fall gewesen. Sie haben das Ritual der Kirche in ihren Dichtungen sehr reichlich benutzt.

JOSEF MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN.

Purdue University.

*Le Romantisme en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*,  
par DANIEL MORNET. Paris, Hachette, 1912.  
X + 288 pp.

The present work of Mr. Mornet will command more than ordinary attention from students both of romanticism and of literary history in general, for aside from the interest which attaches to the specific subject treated, the book will doubtless be taken as a test of the value of that *méthode objective* represented by the author. Not the least significant part of this volume is therefore the brief *avertissement* which sets out its plan and scope and serves incidentally as the author's *apologia pro domo sua*.

"On ne pouvait rien écrire de précis, il y a dix ans, sur les origines lointaines du romantisme, et nous pourrions nous divertir à collectionner les erreurs ou opposer les contradictions. Leur histoire, au contraire, est aujourd'hui connue, et tous les problèmes essentiels sont résolus. On en trouvera pour une part l'étude méthodique dans un certain nombre de travaux que nous avons publiés depuis huit ans."

The author here gives us *in primis* a list of his own recent special studies, whose high scholarly character we take this occasion to commend, and the value of whose results, if properly handled and interpreted, we should be the first to recognize.

The exordium is somewhat controversial and would seem to condemn by implication, as imprecise and contradictory, the work of that pupil of Brunetière's, Texte, whose *J. J. Rousseau et les Origines du Cosmopolitisme littéraire* was written in the dark ages of the nineties (1895). Since we are assured that all the essential problems have now been solved, we

were justified in hoping that Mr. Mornet would give us something definite and more or less final on the distant origins of this much debated movement.

This is not the place to discuss whether literary history is or is not a science. It is safe to say, however, that in order to write that *quelque chose de précis* on the *origines lointaines du romantisme* the literary historian would need to have at his command the method of the exact sciences, the method, in other words, of experimental demonstration. One of the facts on which the author lays special emphasis and which is perhaps the most unique element in his book, is the importance which he assigns to the prevalence of the *jardin anglais* in France after 1750. He deals with it at length in his introduction and conclusion and refers to it repeatedly in the body of his work, and we may therefore safely assume that he intends it to throw some light on his problem. Mornet would doubtless be the first to admit that *Julie ou La Nouvelle Héloïse* is a romantic work. Yet, so far as we know, before the date of its composition Rousseau had never entered and had never seen an English garden.<sup>1</sup> If he had, the fact made so little impression on him that he fails to record it in the *Confessions*. This being true, the English garden was in no sense a source of romanticism, it did not seriously influence this most characteristic manifestation of its spirit, and in all probability was not even a necessary concomitant of the movement.<sup>2</sup> In order to tell

<sup>1</sup> There is a possibility that Rousseau had learned about English gardens from an article in the *Mercur*, 1750, mentioned by Mornet in his earlier work. Unless Stowe is there misspelled as Rousseau misspells it (*cf. infra*) it is more probable that he learned of them from hearsay. They were certainly new and strange to Diderot, Rousseau's friend until about the time of writing the *Julie*, as late as Sept. 20, 1765. (*Lettre à Sophie Volland* of that date.)

<sup>2</sup> In his earlier study, *Le Sentiment de la nature en France de J. J. Rousseau à Bernardin de Saint Pierre* (of which work the present volume seems in some parts to be a by-product and in others a repetition), Mornet tends to convey the impression that the *Elysée* of Rousseau's *Julie* is to be taken as an example, and perhaps the first example in French literature, of the English garden (p. 222). Rous-

whether or not the English garden had anything to do with the origin of romanticism, it would have to be possible for us to call back from the dead a recognized classicist, let us say La Fontaine, and living again in the Marquis de Girardin's garden, have him rewrite for us *Les deux Pigeons* or *Le Paysan du Danube*. If, all other things being equal, he wrote them differently, the measure of this difference would indicate the degree of importance which could be attached to this fact, and we could then write something precise.

It is not our purpose here to discuss in detail the facts set forth by Mr. Mornet. On this side he offers us little that is new, giving us for the most part merely synopses of recent investigations, very largely his own, which have already been reviewed here and elsewhere. With the present volume, he challenges atten-

seau, at a later period, April 17, 1772, certainly took credit to himself for having been the first to introduce it (*Œuvres*, Vol. VI, p. 77). At this time Rousseau had probably forgotten, and curiously enough, Mornet seems to have overlooked the fact, that in the same letter in which St. Preux describes the *Elysée*, he indicates his disapproval of a recognized *jardin anglais*, "le parc célèbre de milord Cobham à Stow (Stowe)" (IV, 338). The *Elysée* had cost nothing, as Julie proudly explains (IV, 329) and can hardly be taken as anything more than a modest if fairly unique irregular or informal garden. Such irregular gardens could doubtless have been found around many Swiss châteaux and chalets. As a matter of fact, at about this same time (March, 1761) Voltaire, who was certainly no romanticist, was engaged in laying out gardens at Ferney which from his own description, bear, in certain respects, a remarkable similarity to the *Elysée*. They are totally different from other gardens, "ne ressemblent à rien du tout," and like Rousseau's description they too had "des vignes en festons à perte de vue, presque rien de régulier" (*Correspondance* IX, p. 236; also XIV, p. 279). If then there were classicists like Voltaire who built and were fond of irregular gardens, there were also characters of indubitably romantic temperament, like Mme. Roland, who disapproved of such famous gardens as Ermenonville. In the case of Rousseau's *Elysée*, therefore, it was evidently not the garden that begot the romanticist but the romanticist who begot the garden. If this is true, the sources and origins of romanticism must lie farther back and in things more fundamental. (For a fuller discussion of all these facts we refer however to Mornet's *Le Sentiment de la nature*, pp. 218-258.)

tion not as a scholarly investigator but as a scientific literary historian. The truth of most of his facts, as facts, will be generally recognized. The question at stake is their value and proper interpretation in a history of the origins of romanticism.

However, in this matter of the English gardens we are told (pp. 30-31):

"A travers l'Île-de-France et les provinces, les jardins anglais escaladèrent les collines et emplirent les vallons. Jardins modestes et 'grands comme un mouchoir de poche' tels que celui de Morellet et Marmontel à Auteuil, ou 'folies ruineuses' comme celles où le marquis de Brumoy dépense dix millions et Delaborde, à Méréville, seize millions. Parcs où s'harmonisent des beautés éloquentes, comme ceux d'Ermenonville chez le marquis de Girardin, et du Moulin-Joli, chez Watelet; ou fantaisies laborieuses et stupides de ceux qui mettent, nous dit Roucher, 'la nature en mascarade.' . . . Chantilly, Ermenonville sont illustres. On vient en pèlerinage à Monceaux, à Bagatelle, au Moulin-Joli. La vallée de Montmorency s'emplit tout entière de chemins tournants et d'eaux bondissantes. Lyon imite Paris et Toulouse suit l'exemple de Lyon. Vingt traités, ceux de Watelet, Duchesne, Morel, Girardin, du Prince de Ligne, etc., prodiguent les estampes, les conseils techniques, les exhortations morales. Les poètes accordent leurs lyres."

This seems to us a serious overstatement of the facts. The author, had he chosen to use it more freely, had at his disposal a unique document with which to control his own opinion of the prevalence and importance of English gardens in France. Arthur Young, enthusiastic admirer of Rousseau and avowed lover of the romantic (he himself frequently uses the word), and the greatest eighteenth century authority on agriculture and gardening, travelled, at the close of the period under discussion, for sixteen months, through the entire extent of France, investigating the conditions, manner, and cost of living on French estates. That he was interested in the *jardins anglais* is plain from the manner in which he discusses those which he found. He speaks of them as a fashion recently introduced from England: "The taste is but just introduced into France, so that it will not stand a critical examina-

tion." This, written in 1787, would seem to indicate that most of them were considerably later than we would imply from Mornet, who says (p. 30): "Le XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, après 1760, s'empara d'elle avec une frénésie désordonnée." Yet in the record of his journeys, written day by day, Young seems to have noticed only eight such gardens,<sup>3</sup> several of which he dismisses with contempt. He mentions none in the neighborhood of Lyons and only one in the environs of Toulouse, that of M. Dubarry, of which he gives us the following account:

"As to the garden, it is beneath all contempt, except as an object to make a man stare at the efforts to which folly can arrive: in the space of an acre, there are hills of genuine earth, mountains of pasteboard, rocks of canvas: abbés, cows, sheep, and shepherdesses in lead; monkeys and peasants, asses and altars, in stone. Fine ladies and blacksmiths, parrots and lovers, in wood. Windmills and cottages, shops and villages, nothing excluded except nature."

As the narrative of his travels shows, Young possessed to a very high degree that love of nature which was one of the characteristics of the new movement. Yet the so-called "jardin anglais" in all but two cases (Ermenonville and Harcourt) struck him as a curiosity and an extravagance. He tells us also that there was, in 1789, a model of one, "most miserably imagined," in the Bibliothèque Nationale. This would hardly have been the case had they been so well known and common that they "scaled the heights and filled the valleys" of the Ile-de-France and the provinces. Moreover, certain of the possessors of these gardens were by no means romantic in temperament, and we cannot understand the importance which Mornet assigns to them in the history of romanticism. We might with equal cogency and scientific precision argue that the Romans were more romantic than the Greeks since they built elaborate villas on the hills and by the sea, whereas the Greeks did not. And so far from being a source or cause of romanticism we might with equal justice explain the character

and success of *Hernani* on the score of Gauthier's long hair and notorious red waistcoat.

We might further have expected that an author making pretensions to scientific rigor and precision would begin with some more or less clear-cut and inclusive definition or formulation of the phenomenon whose distant origins he is trying to explain. Such is not the case. Instead of any central definition under which the various aspects of romanticism might have been subsumed and explained, we are given a number of partial formulations. These attempts at definition show that Mr. Mornet is far from clear on the subject and that he has been much impressed by that anti-romantic campaign of recent years. We have gathered together the significant statements given by the way:

"L'oeuvre de Rousseau et des romantiques fut néfaste, si l'on veut. Il est aisé, comme on l'a fait, de suivre les progrès du mal romantique" (p. 273). "Nous rappellerons seulement pour conclure, que Rousseau, Young, Ossian et Werther ne furent ni les seuls ni les premiers coupables. Ils ont aggravé le mal et précipité tout au plus ses ravages" (p. 274). On the same page, however, we are assured, that it was "le rêve de citadins fatigués des salons et des conventions du monde; . . . le rêve tout aussi bien de ceux qui voulurent des vies moins frivoles et plus morales." Again we are told that "Le romantisme au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle fut avant tout le goût profond de la nature" (p. 275). "Le romantisme est autre chose qu'une évolution des mœurs; c'est une polémique de gens de lettres qui renient leur constitution" (p. 177). "Mal du siècle, lâche orgueil des pessimismes, mépris des vies courageuses que l'on dit banales, ce sont les plaies du romantisme que l'on dénonce obstinément. Le romantisme est cela, peut-être. Dès qu'il bouleversa les jardins les germes funestes fermentèrent, si l'on veut, pour distiller les poisons certains. Pourtant le mal au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle ne semble qu'un accident" (p. 146). "Le romantisme ce sont les émotions légères et douces qui furent chères à Saint-Preux, c'est le cœur qui s'ouvre aux 'tristesses délicieuses'; c'est la vie secrète des solitudes et du silence. C'est la rêverie et la mélancolie" (p. 92).

The "goût profond de la nature" and the dream of those who desired less frivolous and more moral lives are of course neither 'néfaste'

<sup>3</sup> Young's *Travels in France*, London, Reprint of 1913, pp. 11, 33, 82, 86, 87, 101, 118, 191.

nor 'un mal.' We have already discussed the absurdly exaggerated importance which the author attributes to the introduction of the English garden and which he here looks upon as the signal of the approaching dissolution (p. 146). But since it is impossible to weld such contradictions into any consistent whole, we may for a moment consider the definition which seems to be fullest and most precise, that of p. 92. If we submit it to an empiric test by attempting to fit it to the work of recognized romanticists of the generation of 1830, we shall readily be convinced of its inadequacy. Hugo, for instance, who describes himself in the person of *Hernani* as "une force qui va," did not deal primarily with the 'émotions légères et douces,' nor did the heart of the author of *Le Pas d'Armes du Roi Jean* open by preference to 'tristesses délicieuses.' Neither was the author of *Notre Dame de Paris* an expounder of 'la vie secrète des solitudes et du silence,' and if he occasionally indulged in revery, the Hugo of 1830 was not by nature melancholy. In fact, according to this principle of classification, he was not a romanticist at all. Either we must reject this definition or else the romanticism here discussed is not that of typical authors generally recognized as romantic. The unsatisfactory character of the definitions is indicative of a fundamental weakness in Mr. Mornet's method. He thinks he is explaining when he is merely describing, and his descriptions are far from exhaustive.

Aside from the English garden, Mr. Mornet adduces as origins of romanticism the increased fondness for passion and its "douceurs mortelles," in real life, the prevalence of "âmes vagabondes," the frequent employment of the language of passion in literature around and shortly before 1750, the fact that readers now began to prefer "la fidélité des peintures où la vie réelle se reflète," the English influence and the love of nature. In substantiation he cites detached sentences, especially from the minor novelists of that period, such as le chevalier de Bastide, le chevalier de Mouhy, and Thibouville. We must object in the first place that these facts, if they really possess signifi-

cance, are not the origins or sources of romanticism; the origins or sources of romanticism lie in the causes of these phenomena, which are already its results and the more or less vague indications of its presence. In the second place these phenomena are not as new in French literary history as the author would have us believe.

The "douceurs mortelles" of passionate attachments in real life could easily be found in the preceding century, witness the life history of Molière, that of the amazing Mlle. de la Force, who dressed as a gypsy exhibitor of bears in order to gain admittance to the court of her lover's hôtel, the Duchesse de Mazarin who drew the blinds and starved herself to death when her lover began to show signs of fondness for her daughter, and a little later in the early thirties, the Claude Anet of the *Confessions* who swallowed opium after having been wounded by a word of his mistress. Yet no literary historian has ever seen in the peasant of Moutru a precursor or inventor of romanticism. All these and doubtless hundreds of others, unknown to history, had in that earlier period experienced the "bouleversements de la passion" and its "douceurs mortelles."

As for the freer use in literature of the language of passion, Mr. Mornet cites as something especially striking a passage from de Mouhy:

"Il arrive bien pis au commandeur de . . . lorsqu'il voit pour la première fois sa bien-aimée; pâleur mortelle, tremblement universel, démarche chancelante, abattement, faiblesse ou plutôt 'extinction presque totale' de son bon sens et de ses forces" (p. 6).

Far from being new, this is one of the oldest literary conventions and runs back certainly as far as the account of the meeting of Dante and Beatrice in the *Vita Nuova* of which it seems an almost exact transcription.

As for the dreamy, melancholy, love-sick hero, he too could be found. We would cite only the *Dragut* and *Lautrec* of Mlle. de la Force's *Histoire de la Reine de Navarre*. In the same volume, Mlle. de la Force speaks of "la musique et la mélancolie de l'amour."

With regard to revery, why not have mentioned La Fontaine's so characteristic

Car que faire en un gîte, à moins que l'on ne songe?  
On these phases of his subject, Mr. Mornet would have found a great deal that is significant in Waldberg's *Der Empfindsame Roman in Frankreich*, a work which he neither cites nor mentions in his bibliography here or in his earlier volume.

With regard to the "fidélité des peintures où la vie réelle se reflète," he would have found much of it a century earlier in a work which, curiously enough, he completely ignores, Scarron's *Roman Comique*. It is also to be found in the *Vraye Histoire Comique de Francion* (1622), which certainly met with popular approval since it was sixty times reprinted in the seventeenth century, as well as in *Le Baron de Faeneste* (1617-1620), and in Théophile's *Fragments d'Histoire Comique*. Furthermore, in the *Roman Comique* of Scarron, Destin's romantic story of his love for the beautiful Léonore foreshadows the later Graziellas quite as completely as anything Mr. Mornet gives us in his period. Nor are such indications of realism absent from the poetry of *le grand siècle*. In this connection we cannot do better than cite a passage from Fournel, which though written many years ago, is as true now as it was then:

"Du reste, pendant les premières années du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle, il y a déjà comme un courant de réalité dans l'air par un naturel esprit de réaction contre les tendances opposées qui commençaient à se manifester, et qui devaient régner principalement de 1650 à 1680. On trouve dans G. Colletet, dans Théophile, dans les poésies détachées de Saint-Amant, et même dans son *Moïse Sauvé*, comme plus tard dans *La Pucelle* de Chapelain, une manie de descriptions minutieuses dont s'est moqué Boileau et qui ne recule pas toujours devant les détails où la familiarité devient triviale et la trivialité grotesque et repoussante."

If the sources and origins of romanticism are to be sought in these isolated phenomena, Mr. Mornet should have sought them not in the eighteenth but in the seventeenth century. Furthermore, if he really intended to throw light on its causes, he should have explained

why the English influence reached such vast proportions in the eighteenth century when for literary history it was negligible in the seventeenth. The external cause of this English influence, the forced emigration to the north of 200,000 independently-minded French citizens after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, he would have found in Texte's admirable study which he mentions only in his bibliography, and whose significant conclusions he does not seem to have taken seriously. As for the real origins of the growth of nature-feeling, he would have found much to his purpose in Friedländer's excellent work,<sup>4</sup> which, like Texte's, was written considerably more than ten years ago. This he fails to mention even in his bibliography to *Le Sentiment de la nature*.

Men do not create a new literature until they have become dissatisfied with the old. Why French classicism failed to satisfy the public of 1750 we are not told. It is never even hinted that the eighteenth century believed in progress and that the seventeenth did not, and that therefore merely in order to keep abreast of the trend of the times it was necessary, as Chénier tells us in his *L'Invention*, to change the literary forms and materials. There is nothing to explain the return to mediaevalism, though the answer is to be found in the importance which Mme. de Staël was shortly to assign to chivalry and Christianity as basic factors in modern life. We would not know from Mornet that the reading public to whom this literature was addressed had changed in its personnel and that its creators were not servants of the king but for the most part independent men of letters, whose social and political environment was unsatisfactory. He sees no connection between the movement that begot the new literature and the new political régime, in fact, does not once mention the Revolution, and sees nothing of consequence in Rousseau's "paradoxes sociaux." And yet the discontent which begot the *Discours* was much the same discontent, certainly the same disposition,

<sup>4</sup>Ueber die Entstehung und Entwicklung des Gefühls für das Romantische in der Natur. Leipzig, 1873.

which begot the new literature, the new government, and the new society. Rousseau, a far better literary historian in this respect than Mornet, and with a keener sense of underlying causes, gives at least one of the reasons when he tells us that in Paris there are "cinq ou six cent mille âmes dont il n'est jamais question sur la scène." (Vol. IV, p. 172.)

So, too, long before Rousseau, Scarron had recorded his discontent when he decides for the "roman plus à notre usage et plus selon la portée de l'humanité que ces héros imaginaires de l'antiquité qui sont quelquefois incommodes à force d'être trop honnêtes gens" (*Roman Comique*, Partie I, Chap. XXI).

The reasons which begot this dissatisfaction with the old were the first causes which impelled both author and audience to seek something "plus à notre usage et plus selon la portée de l'humanité." Even with regard to the theatre there are protests in the seventeenth century against the unities, especially the unity of time, which are not referred to by Mr. Mornet. They are to be found, among others, in Ogier<sup>5</sup> or again in Scarron,<sup>6</sup> and in Claveret.<sup>7</sup> In this history of the causes of discontent with the old regime and its reflection in literature, here nowhere touched upon, are in our opinion to be sought "*les origines lointaines du romantisme*." And why romanticism took the particular form that it did must be explained out of the general trends of thought, here likewise completely ignored. Locke and sensationalism, for instance, are never once mentioned in the work. These fundamental conditions and underlying trends and tendencies which might have given unity to his work and provided him with a basis for definition seem to lie entirely outside his field. Instead of the precise information on the history of romanticism promised us in the *avertissement* he has given us instead certain chapters in the history of French manners, some of which are germane and some of which are not. Only a complete disregard of

underlying causes and their relative importance could allow a literary historian to attach such serious importance to comparative trivialities, like the English garden here everywhere raised to a position of the first importance, and to give us the following in his conclusion:

"Morellet ou Marmontel ne songent à écrire ni des Obermann, ni des René; mais ils se plaisent à faire de leur jardin d'Auteuil un jardin anglais dont les libres verdures auraient pu plaire à René ou à Obermann. On ne rime ni *le Lac* ni *le Vallon*, ni *Ce qu'on entend sur la montagne*, ni *les Orientales*; mais les voyageurs et les promeneurs vont chercher sur les rives de Genève, de Thun, de Neuchâtel, d'Annecy, les rêveries crépusculaires" (p. 271).

Personally we do not believe that Obermann, that lover of the wild, who hid in a cave far from men, would have had anything but the profoundest contempt for Marmontel's artificial little garden; and as for pleasing Chateaubriand, considering his personality, it would be safer as a general rule to say that anything which pleased anyone else would not have pleased René.

We regret that the author should so completely ignore Fénelon's influence. He does not, for instance, tell us, that in the *Lettre sur les occupations de l'Académie* (1716), we have outlined a program which includes a number of the elements of romantic poetry. This fact would perhaps cause him certain difficulties since the *Lettre* was written long before English gardens were instituted, or even dreamed of, in France.

In conclusion, we will call attention to a few inaccuracies of presentation. The book is illustrated with sixteen plates, one of them (p. 74) a reproduction of the notorious "Young enterrant sa fille," which served in Letourneur's translation as frontispiece of the *Nuits*. Since it is published here without comment it might mislead. The incident of the burial as there represented is pure fiction, a lugubrious hoax perpetrated on the public by Young himself, and the currency given to this "romantic" story of the persecuted poet Young with his own hands burying his daughter alone at night in a neglected cemetery perhaps had as much

<sup>5</sup> Preface to *Tyr et Sidon*. Bib. Elzévirienne, No. 11, p. 13.

<sup>6</sup> *Roman Comique*, Partie I, Chap. XXI.

<sup>7</sup> *Traité de la disposition du poème dramatique*.

to do with his celebrity in France as did his works.

"Le goût pour les ruines gothiques, pour les sépulcres que hantent les fantômes s'unit aux souvenirs d'Ossian et ébaucha déjà les nuits hallucinées où se complairont les lecteurs de Walter Scott" (p. 119). There are few or no such 'nuits hallucinées' in Scott, who was above all virile; there are in Coleridge, and the sort of thing here referred to might be found in the German romanticists.

We find (pp. 183-184) the statement: "Mais tous [manuels, traités, encyclopédies] citent Boileau avec respect et restent dociles à son esprit." Diderot, in his own *Encyclopaedia*, speaks with scant respect of "ce versificateur Boileau," and some of Mr. Mornet's later references likewise tend to contradict this assertion.

Pages 219-224 deal with what the eighteenth-century writers and critics called "la poésie lyrique." When eighteenth-century writers speak of the *poème lyrique*, they usually mean merely a poem to be set to music and the phrase denotes the madrigals of La Motte or Fontenelle much more truly than poems like *Le Valon* or *Les Nuits*. This should have been brought out more clearly.

CHRISTIAN GAUSS.

Princeton University.

---

*Nietzsche and Art.* By ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI.  
Boston: John W. Luce and Co., 1912. \$1.50.

One advantage of being a Nietzschean is that it enables one to speak authoritatively on all subjects, to impose one's master-mind, one's "ruler" qualities, one's "wil to power," on all inferior beings. The tone of the superman is what annoys one in all such works and is that which wil ultimately prevent the Filosofer from coming into his own: for the unconverted superman wil rebel and destroy—as is his right—and the awed inferior being wil flee away to that destruction which is advised for him as one of the too, too many. This wil, in either case, leave the Nietzschean filosofer without the audience for his preachments, and surely

without that worship which his general assumption of the only "wil to power" seems to demand.

In Ludovici's book, clever and deliteful as it is, the same general assumption of indifference to historical phenomena, to the other man's point of view and psychology ar apparent. Paradoxical as it may seem, this stimulating work is hard to take seriously. Its very arrogation of the profetic tone, the beginning of each chapter with a scriptural citation and the ending of each—obviusly as a climax—with a quotation to be regarded as of inspirational force from "Thus Spake Zarathustra," giv the layman pause. One feels the danger of dout, for one wud be clast among the supermen; one longs to agree and thus leave the mass of obeyers and join the few chance products—"sports" they ar cald in botany—who alone can galvanize the ded masses of the ordinary. But one's unfortunate democracy makes one suspect that there is something in this aristocratizm which is a "fake," and that the superman is often nothing but a defeated Titan, and not a Titan in the Woodberry sense of the term either!

But it is perfectly obvius that there is something the matter with our present art values. The confusion in all the arts, the babble about great names, the rediness to run after strange gods, to post-future the futurists, to raise to the *n*-th power the cubists, to gape at pseudo art and to over-emfasize technik, ar sines of a decay in our creativ power. But whether we see the cause in extension of Christian morality—Nietzsche's slave morality—or in science, or in the acceptance of the theory of evolution, it is by no means clear, because Nietzsche says so, that the lay mind is the helpless mind and that the "ruler artist" is the imposer of beauty and the creator of esthetic values in a race. The Nietzschean doctrin of the "wil to power" may hold good in the intentions of an artist, and as an explanation of his unconscious hold on his civilization at its best, but it is too late in the history of the world to evaluate art only as an abstraction and the artist as the sole abstractor. The error of Ludovici is in supposing, as a con-